

### REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were pending. Claims 1-4 are allowed. Claims 5-15 stand rejected. Claims 8 and 15 have been amended.

#### CLAIM 5

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard. Applicant respectfully traverses.

On February 22, 2007, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney discussed Picard and claim 5 over the telephone. The Examiner agreed that claim 5 was patentable over Picard. Specifically, Picard does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed element “responsive to determining that the second server is available: retrieving a voice mail message from the first server.”

#### CLAIMS 8, 15

Claims 8-10 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shaffer. Applicant respectfully traverses.

On February 22, 2007, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney discussed Shaffer and claim 8 over the telephone. The attorney explained that the phrase “the server is one of a plurality of servers on which voice mail extensions reside” means that there exists a plurality of servers on which voice mail extensions reside. For clarification purposes, this phrase has been amended to recite “the server is one of a plurality of servers, and wherein voice mail extensions reside on each server of the plurality of servers.”

The Examiner agreed that if claim 8 were amended in this way, it would be patentable over Shaffer. Specifically, Shaffer does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed element “a call transfer module, configured to determine a call’s voice mail extension and a server on which the voice mail extension resides, wherein the server is one of a plurality of servers, and wherein voice mail extensions reside on each server of the plurality of servers.”

Claim 15 as amended recites similar language is likewise patentable over Shaffer for at least the same reasons.

#### OTHER CLAIMS

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Sherwood. Applicant respectfully traverses. This claim depends from claim 8, which is patentable over Shaffer. In addition, claim 11 recites other features not included in claim 8. Thus, claim 11 is patentable over Shaffer in view of Sherwood. Additionally, for the record, Applicant traverses the Examiner’s assertions concerning the disclosure of Sherwood and the motivation to combine Shaffer and Sherwood.

The claims not specifically mentioned above depend from their respective base claims, which were shown to be patentable over Picard and Shaffer. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, these claims are patentable over Picard and Shaffer, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and requests that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCOTT A. VAN GUNDY

Dated: February 23, 2007

By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/

Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No. 55,687  
Attorney for Applicant  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax: (650) 938-5200